DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 368 710 SP 035 145

AUTHOR DelGesso, Daniel D.; Smith, Marion P.

TITLE The Undergraduate Student Teaching Experience: Perspectives of Student Teachers, Cooperating Teachers, and Student Teacher Supervisors.

PUB DATE Jun 93

NOTE 34p.; Abridged version of a study conducted at Temple University, College of Education (Fall 1992).

AVAILABLE FROM Daniel D. DelGesso/Marison P. Smith, Temple University, College of Education, Philadelphia, PA 19122.

PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS Attitude Measures; Classroom Techniques; *Cooperating Teachers; Elementary Secondary Education; Evaluation Research; Higher Education; Preservice Teacher Education; Program Administration; *Program Attitudes; Program Evaluation; Program Improvement; *Student Teachers; *Student Teacher Supervisors; *Student Teaching; Teacher Education Programs; *Undergraduate Students

ABSTRACT

The purposes of this study were threefold: (1) to obtain information on perceptions of student teachers, cooperating teachers, and student teacher supervisors regarding the substance, appropriateness, and value of the undergraduate teacher education program at Temple University (Pennsylvania); (2) to identify areas for teacher education program improvement; and (3) to guide in the development of further program evaluation measures. Subjects, undergraduate elementary and secondary education student teachers (N=110), cooperating teachers (N=110), and student teacher supervisors (N=15), completed surveys containing objectively oriented Likert scale and open ended questions. Results identify concerns worthy of consideration including classroom management and discipline, field experiences, practical classroom skills, school bureaucracy, and orientation to and administration of the student teaching experience. Since the findings of this research closely parallel those found in prior studies, it is concluded that while it is valid to evaluate other components of the teacher education process, unless steps are taken to refine the process in its present form, further surveys using similar populations with a similar focus are unnecessary and redundant. (Contains 25 references.) (IAH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 368 710

THE UNDERGRADUATE STUDENT TEACHING EXPERIENCE: PERSPECTIVES OF STUDENT TEACHERS, COOPERATING TEACHERS, AND STUDENT TEACHER SUPERVISORS

Daniel D. DelGesso & Marion P. Smith

© June 1993

College of Education

Temple University

Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19122

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

D. DelGesso

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

SP035145

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Contents

	page
Preface	iii
Abstract	iv
Introduction	5
Summary of Student Teacher Survey Responses	10
Summary of Cooperating Teacher Survey Responses	12
Summary of Student Teacher Supervisor Survey Responses	13
Discussion, Focus Areas, Conclusion	15
References	31

Preface

This paper is an abridged version of a study conducted in the fall semester of 1992 at Temple University's College of Education. It contains the abstract, introduction, respondent summaries and a discussion of the findings of that study. The entire report, with question by question survey responses of the three study groups, survey instruments and figures is available through the authors.

Abstract

An evaluative process of the undergraduate student teaching experience at Temple University was executed in the Fall of 1992. The purpose was to obtain information on the perceptions of student teachers, cooperating teachers and student teacher supervisors regarding the substance, appropriateness, and value of the undergraduate teacher preparation program. The intent was to gather information to identify areas for teacher education program improvement, and to guide in the development of further program evaluation measures.

The subjects were the 110 undergraduate elementary and secondary education student teachers, 110 cooperating teachers and 15 student teacher supervisors involved in the Fall 1992 program.

Surveys containing objectively oriented likert scale and open ended questions were used to obtain information on the facts, beliefs, and perceptions about the subjects' experiences in the student teaching process. Survey results identify concerns worthy of consideration and point out the need for follow up studies. The concerns that emerged were in the areas of: classroom management and discipline, field experiences, practical classroom skills, school bureaucracy, orientation to and administration of the student teaching process.

The findings of this evaluation closely parallel those found in prior studies conducted both at this and other colleges/universities. While it is valid to evaluate other components of the teacher education process, unless steps are taken to refine the process in its present form, further surveys using similar populations with a similar focus are unnecessary and redundant.

Introduction

In October of 1992, the Chairperson of the Department of Curriculum, Instruction, and Technology in Education (CITE) requested the design and execution of an evaluative process of the student teaching experience at Temple University's College of Education. The purpose of this examination was to obtain information on the perceptions of student teachers, cooperating teachers and student teacher supervisors as to the substance, the appropriateness, and the value of the undergraduate teacher preparation program. The projected intent was not to prove or disprove preconceived suppositions, but rather to gather information to identify areas for teacher education program improvement, and to guide in the development of further program evaluation measures. Toward that end, this inquiry was implemented as a precursor of further evaluations. According to Galluzzo and Craig (1990), "the social context on which teacher education programs operate changes over time and, therefore, what was appropriate and acceptable at one time might not be at another" (p. 606). To determine areas for program improvement, systematic evaluation should be conducted.

According to Arthur E. Wise, President of The National Council for Accreditation in Teacher Education (NCATE), accreditation means, in part, that teacher education institutions "constantly work toward excellence and self improvement in their programs" (Presidential memo in NCATE press release, 1993, p. 6). Teacher educators have a responsibility to gather evidence on the degree to which knowledge and strategies persist with graduates of their teacher education programs (Lindsay, 1985). This ideology is reflected in NCATE standard II.B, which states that, "The unit keeps abreast of emerging evaluation techniques and engages in regular and systematic evaluations, including

follow up studies...to modify and improve programs" (National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education, 1992, p. 52).

Before attempting follow up studies with program graduates, it was necessary to first gain an understanding about the attitudes of those involved in the student teaching process, i.e., student teachers, cooperating teachers and student teaching supervisors, to determine facts, beliefs, and perceptions about their experiences. The subjects for this study were the 110 student teachers (83 elementary education and 23 secondary education), the 110 cooperating teachers and the 15 student teaching supervisors involved in the Fall 1992 teacher education program. The focus was on competency: real, perceived and expected. Issues such as, "How well is the teacher education program meeting the needs of our students?" and "How well are we preparing students to become effective teachers?" were considered.

The objective of the project was threefold:

a) develop an understanding of the student teaching experience which would,

b) increase our knowledge of the teacher education process in order to,

c) improve the teacher education program through data gathered via organized feedback, e.g., surveys.

In order to meet the above objective, the following four components were addressed:

1. The organization of the student teaching experience as it relates to the level of support student teachers, cooperating teachers and supervisors receive from those involved in the process.
2. The utility of the student teaching manual and the senior seminar.

3. The degree to which students are receiving teaching information with regard to:
   a) skills - technique and methodology,
   b) training - as classroom managers,
   c) knowledge - subject matter,
   d) courses - pragmatic course content, and
   e) orientation - to the teaching experience.
4. Perceptions of the overall strengths and weaknesses of the teacher education program.

A global, inductive approach was adopted. Student teachers were asked to assess the program contributions to competencies relevant to teaching effectiveness. Cooperating teachers and supervisors were asked to assess the same competencies as exhibited by the student teacher(s) they supervised. It should be noted that the intent was to examine perspectives about Temple's teacher preparation program as a whole, and not individual classes and/or faculty. An examination procedure for assessment of classes and faculty presently exists in the College of Education Teaching Evaluation form.

A literature search was conducted to gather information on teacher education program evaluation, as well as information on local teacher education programs and the methods and instruments employed (if any) to assess the quality of their programs. Following this review, a survey instrument for student teachers was developed.

The first draft of the (student) questionnaire was examined and reviewed by Temple University supervisors and the Director of Field Placement, who provided feedback and suggestions about items they felt should be addressed and included in the instrument. The

questionnaire was then pre-tested for readability and reliability using a sample of 10 current student teachers. These students also identified the issues and topics they wanted to see addressed in the questionnaire. Based on the feedback obtained during this process, a final revision was made. Subsequently, this instrument was also adapted for use by cooperating teachers and supervisors.

The final version of the student surveys were administered on November 23 and December 4, 1992. The surveys consisted of questions with likert type scales ("excellent," "very good," "adequate," "insufficient," "unsatisfactory," "not applicable") with room for comments, in addition to open ended questions. Elementary education student teachers completed their survey during the senior seminar class. Secondary education student teachers (who do not have a senior seminar) were accessed through their Temple University supervisors. Cooperating teachers were also accessed through Temple University supervisors. The surveys were given to supervisors on November 12, 1992 with the request that they distribute, collect and return their (supervisors) completed surveys, as well as those of the secondary education students and the cooperating teachers through a predetermined retrieval process.

The elementary education response rate was 81% (67 out of 83). This rate was attributed to student absenteeism on the dates the surveys were administered. The supervisor response rate was 100% (15 out of 15). Response rates were lower when supervisors were assigned with the task of administering cooperating teacher and secondary education student teacher surveys. Consequently, the cooperating teacher response rate was 47% (52 out of 110) and the secondary education student teacher response rate was 52% (12 out of 23). For future evaluations, the process of survey

administration should be refined to ensure higher response rates.

In early January 1993, quantifiable data from the likert type responses located within the surveys was tallied. The completed surveys were then reviewed to identify and categorize the response commentary. Student teacher, cooperating teacher and student teacher supervisor commentary was examined, listed and categorized. Discrepancies and/or ambiguity in the comments were resolved through discussion and consensus. Responses to the open ended questions are not quantified. Nevertheless, they are depicted in the narration using descriptive terminology (e.g., most, many) that reflect prevalent themes in the respondents' commentary.

What follows is a portrayal of the information compiled from the review of the completed surveys, utilizing statistical information from the likert type responses in combination with selected (quoted) comments reflecting the essence of the survey populations' concerns with regard to the questions.

Summary of Student Teacher Survey Responses

Population: The total population of undergraduate student teachers was 110; 83 were elementary and 23 were secondary education student teachers. The survey was administered to elementary education majors in the Senior Seminar class. Secondary education majors were accessed through their supervisors. In all, we received 79 completed student teacher surveys reflecting a 72% response rate for this population. Of this total, 67 were elementary education majors and 12 were secondary education majors.

The information on this page presents representative comments by the respondents to the survey questions.

• *Practicums:* A vast majority of student teachers express the desire to increase the amount of time they spend in the schools. They indicate that if practicums were longer, or if there were more practicums, they would have the opportunity to observe a variety of school settings, teaching styles and children at different grade levels. Overall, the student teachers say that the program should provide them with more exposure to schools and children earlier, and with greater frequency, to better prepare them for the reality of a teaching career.

• *Classroom Management:* The majority of student teachers feel inadequate in their ability to manage and discipline a classroom and accommodate difficult students. They feel that these areas are neglected in Temple's teacher education program. They ask that management and discipline techniques be incorporated into the methods classes, or a course be devoted to these aspects of teaching. Many students indicate that more practicums could have helped them by giving them opportunities to observe how other teachers handle management and discipline in their classrooms.

• *Senior Seminar:* The student teachers express the need for support and the opportunity to discuss and process their student teaching experience. They feel the Senior Seminar should provide these opportunities by giving students occasions to interact and "network" with their peers and to have their concerns addressed by the Seminar instructor. But, as many students note, the seminar contains too many (more than 80) of them to be accommodated by one instructor. They feel that the structure of the seminar is impractical, and the work they are required to do is excessive and not relevant to their student teaching experience.

• *Supervisors:* While many student teachers are satisfied in their relationships with their supervisors, others express a need for more support. They want better accessibility to supervisors, including more scheduled visits and observations. Many of these students are unclear about their supervisor's expectations of them; they indicate a desire for clearer communication and constructive, helpful feedback on their teaching. Students look to their supervisors for support, encouragement, advice, ideas and suggestions on how they can improve their teaching.

• *Cooperating Teachers:* Overwhelmingly, the student teachers indicate that their cooperating teachers are of invaluable help to them. Many students indicate that the period of time spent student teaching is the most substantial part of the teacher education program. Overall, the student teachers are extremely gratified by their relationships with their cooperating teachers.

Summary of Cooperating Teacher Survey Responses

Population: The cooperating teacher population was 110. One cooperating teacher was enlisted for each of the 83 elementary and 23 secondary education student teachers. Cooperating teachers were accessed through Temple University Supervisors. Cooperating teacher surveys were given to supervisors with the request that they distribute and collect them when completed. 52 completed cooperating teacher surveys were received for a response rate of 47%.

The information on this page presents representative comments by the respondents to the survey questions.

The main areas of concern to cooperating teachers were:

• The majority of cooperating teachers are concerned over what they feel is a lack of communication between themselves and the Temple University supervisors. They indicate uncertainty about the role of the supervisors and the supervisor's expectations of the cooperating teachers and their student teachers. They express a desire for more contact with the supervisors; they want opportunities to confer with the supervisors to discuss ideas, observations and comments about the student teachers' progress. They feel it is important for cooperating teachers and supervisors to work closely together to best determine ways to help student teachers improve their skills and meet their goals.

• Again and again throughout the survey, cooperating teachers indicate classroom management as an area which needs more emphasis in the teacher education program. Cooperating teachers have communicated that, while Temple University students may be able to put together well developed lessons, they will not be successful in presenting them without strategies and techniques to manage their students. Many cooperating teachers

feel that these skills need to be learned through observation and practice in an actual school setting, and therefore, students should spend more of their time in the field prior to student teaching. Many also feel that Temple University should emphasize classroom management in their teacher education program by integrating management strategies in methods courses, or by offering a course devoted to classroom management.

• Most cooperating teachers feel that three months of student teaching at the end of the education program is insufficient. They indicate that students need to spend more time in the field to get a better understanding of the day to day processes in a school. Some feel students do not come into student teaching with realistic expectations about teaching, and do not have enough practical knowledge about the routine tasks of a teacher, i.e., record keeping, paperwork, etc. They feel that more time spent in the schools will help students deal with the situations and problems teachers confront each day.

• Cooperating teachers would like more preparation prior to student teaching in terms of Temple University's policies and expectations. Many request some type of pre-student teaching seminar, workshop or orientation process.

Summary of Student Teacher Supervisor Survey Responses

Population: The total population of 15 consisted of the nine Temple University supervisors of undergraduate student teachers, as well as the six supervising teachers from one of the Professional Development Schools. (Temple University supervisors who worked exclusively with graduate student teachers were not asked to complete the survey.) Completed surveys were received from everyone in this population.

The information on this page presents representative comments by the respondents to the survey questions.

The main concerns reported by the supervisors are as follows:

• It is felt that one semester of student teaching is insufficient. Students should have opportunities to observe and interact in classrooms early and frequently throughout the teacher education program in order to gain realistic and practical experience in teaching.

• Supervisors feel there are deficiencies in student teachers' classroom management skills. They stress that this is a very important aspect of teaching and should be given more emphasis in Temple's teacher education program.

• The oral and written communication skills (speaking in a grammatically correct fashion, using clear penmanship on the blackboard, etc.) of some student teachers is deemed below par by the supervisors. They feel that Temple should have higher standards in this area.

• The supervisors would like to have more information about their assignments to schools and students before the start of the semester.

Discussion

The student teaching experience was examined to provide a better understanding of the teacher education process. The focus was on the program as a whole, rather than individual classes and/or individual persons. The perceptions and common concepts that ran throughout all three of the populations involved in the student teaching experience were identified. The literature shows that these types of studies have been done in other colleges, resulting in similar responses. Self evaluation is necessary in order to identify the concerns unique to each university; while the findings are universal, the ways in which colleges address these findings are not. It is difficult to find solutions to the concerns raised in the surveys in the literature on program evaluations because each college is unique and therefore, the resolutions are not generalizable.

In part, the approach to studying this process is in accordance with Astin (1990), who states in his discussion of preliminary student surveys:

> The single most important survey to be incorporated into a newly developing student database is a follow-up of students who have just completed (or are about to complete) their programs. The survey should include at least three basic types of information:
>
> 1. student satisfaction (overall, as well as with quality of instruction)
> 2. self-reported talent development (general knowledge, knowledge of specific subject matter)
> 3. environmental experiences. (p. 160)

Over the last 20 years, evaluations have been done at Temple University that have generated similar conclusions as found in the Fall 1992 surveys. A 1987 Temple University NCATE report discusses a 1979 full scale evaluation of teacher certification programs. The 1979 study was based on the findings of a 1973 evaluation. The 1987 NCATE report discusses results of the 1979 evaluation, and quotes the final report to the Dean of the College of Education as saying, "...An overall summary of the results [indicates] that the responses to the questions seem more positive than negative throughout the various aspects of the program evaluated." And that, "The [respondents] would like to see more teaching related activities such as classroom control, remediation of problems, record keeping, etc., added to the program." Although the organization and administration of the Fall 1992 survey instruments were not influenced by past evaluation methods conducted at Temple University, it is interesting to note that almost parallel findings were obtained as in the prior studies. The 1987 report also states that evaluation results, "led to a review of the foundations courses in the college and to a rethinking of those aspects of the programs which the graduates found to be weakest" (p. 66), but does not go into specifics about what (if anything) was actually done to address the concerns expressed in the 1979 survey. The 1992 survey findings are in agreement with Galluzzo and Craig's (1990) assertion that "graduates would like professional programs that anticipate most of the problems beginning teachers encounter and training in how to solve them" (p. 611). This is consistent with Page's (1983) suggestion that, "Designers of curricula for teacher education programs need to place greater emphasis on public school organization, legal responsibilities, parenting and discipline" (p. 7).

While teacher education program studies subsequent to the 1987 NCATE Review

Report were not conducted, further evaluations are necessary for program improvement. "Evaluations should be conducted because they can inform participants of the strengths and weaknesses of the program in all respects....With the discrepancies made apparent, a program faculty can act to make improvements in the curriculum. In this regard, evaluation is a process that can help teacher educators ask the best questions, collect and analyze the most relevant data, and design more efficient and responsive programs" (Galluzzo and Craig, p. 605).

Instead of making specific recommendations per se, salient items that arose in the surveys were identified, commented upon and responded to, taking into consideration their surrounding context, utilizing material uncovered during review of the literature. This information is presented to the readers so they can make their own judgements.

Focus Areas

Field Experiences

In Zeichner's (1992) discussion of rethinking the practicum he states, "...learning to teach is a process that continues throughout a teacher's career and that no matter what we do in our teacher education programs and no matter how well we do it, at best we can only prepare teachers to begin teaching" (p. 297).

On the subject of future teacher field experience, the literature indicates, and the population of student teachers, cooperating teachers and supervisors in this study all agree, that the most beneficial element of the teacher education process is the time spent in actual classrooms. Student teachers cite constructive feedback, support and helpful information as indicative of good, positive, beneficial relationships with cooperating teachers and supervisors. They indicate that through field experiences, they become more

sensitive to the reality of what teaching entails. Through the student teaching experience, future teachers learn practical applications of theories, methods, evaluation and measurement techniques they have studied in their coursework, and gain real world orientation to the teaching field. They see how teachers work together, how the school bureaucracy operates, how the dynamics of personalities interact in the classroom, in addition to being involved in lesson preparation, classroom management, and instruction. Classroom management was consistently cited by all three groups of respondents as an area in need of attention in the teacher education program. The term "classroom management" encompasses many aspects, e.g., classroom organization and design, record keeping and setting up role books, creating classroom protocol and enacting disciplinary measures.

Future teachers need exposure to the classroom environment from the very first semester of participation in a teacher education program. Moore (1988) recommends that initial field experiences should include, "experiences as classroom aides in a wide range of school settings (that is, urban/rural; primary/intermediate/middle/secondary; low/high socioeconomic areas; and so on).to give students realistic information and experiences to assist them in making a decision as to whether or not to pursue teaching as a career" (p. 107). In their commentary, the cooperating teacher and supervisor respondents express concern about student teachers coming to the realization that, "it (teaching) is not for them" at a time when it is too late for them to change their academic careers. Not only do prospective teachers need early classroom exposure, they need exposure more frequently and for longer periods of time. Researchers who have examined the scope of the typical practicum (e.g., Goodlad, 1990; Turney, Eltiskik, Towler & Wright, 1985), conclude that

"placing students in a single classroom with a single teacher fails to prepare teachers for the full range of responsibilities they will have to assume" (Zeichner, 1992, p. 299). The survey participants in this study indicate that a three hour practicum once per week is not enough time to observe the developing educational processes in the classroom. The practical knowledge that can be gained from early and frequent exposure to classrooms helps students learn the day to day operations that are a necessary part of teaching. For example, instructional, administrative and clerical aspects of teaching are best learned in the field. As Page (1983) states, "An increase in field based experiences should provide an increase in the level of participation" (p. 7).

Pragmatic training is prevalent in other professions, such as law or medicine, where prospective professionals are exposed to the real life, practical experiences of their field from the beginning of their training. On one hand, field exposure serves as a socialization and weeding out process; on the other hand, those who are inclined to embrace their new profession are reaffirmed in their commitment to the field.

"The experience of teaching itself is a powerful influence on teachers' learning (e.g., Waller, 1932; Zeichner, 1980). If you ask teachers how they learned to teach, they often say they learned through personal trial and error in the classroom and through interactions with students and colleagues, administrators and parents" (National Center for Research on Teacher Education, p. 29).

Seminar

The most helpful aspect of the student teaching seminar, as reported by student teachers who had a seminar (elementary education majors), was the opportunity to gain

practical information about teaching, e.g., the career services presentation on recruitment and interviewing tips, from a variety of professionals, e.g., representatives and speakers from unions and the Philadelphia School District. Also cited as beneficial were the networking opportunities and the exchange of information among student teachers. All students appreciate the opportunity to discuss situations arising in their student teaching experiences with fellow classmates. They seek advice and counseling from fellow student teachers and the seminar instructor regarding everyday issues such as, classroom management, discipline, and school bureaucracy.

There is a real need for a seminar for secondary education majors, some of whom indicate they feel isolated in their student teaching experience. They want more contact with both the University and fellow student teachers. Only elementary education majors presently have a senior seminar.

There is also concern about the structure of the seminar. The group (at the time of our survey there were 80+ students with one instructor) was much too large for one instructor to accommodate the students' needs. Students want smaller groups so they can receive individual assistance with problems, concerns and questions. They also want the practical aspects of teaching covered: classroom management, discipline, whole language, cooperative learning, career guidance, interviewing skills, and school orientation and protocol, and less reiteration of items covered in earlier coursework, e.g., writing lesson plans, teaching methods, etc. It is felt that the assignments required for the seminar are irrelevant and too time consuming.

Supervisors and cooperating teachers suggest increasing the credit load for student teaching to full time as, "this should be their only responsibility for the semester." The student teaching seminar is now an on-campus class taken for three credits; student

teaching alone does not constitute full time status for undergraduate education students. A possible solution lies in the integration of the student teaching experience and the seminar. Corcoran and Andrew (1988) discuss one option:

> The supervisors lead the seminars...The [student teachers] whom each supervisor observes form a seminar group. Each seminar group meets after school for a two-hour session once a week. A weekly writing assignment is used to connect the [student teachers'] individual classroom experiences with the weekly seminar meetings. Letters, journals, and observation notes are examples of the kind of writing which [student teachers] are asked to prepare for seminars. These arrangements enable [supervisors] to integrate supervision and seminars into a curriculum which meets the evolving needs of [student teachers] as they progress through their [experience]. Information gained from observations of the individual [student teachers] at work in their individual classrooms permits the seminar leader to identify some of the problems which some or all [of them] have in common...the seminar has enormous potential as a forum for using the group to help the individual, and the individual [student teacher] is frequently able to help the peer or the entire group. (pp. 18 - 20)

Some of the benefits of having supervisors as seminar leaders include:

- small group size = personal attention (a major complaint of student teachers)
- direct help, support and advice from supervisor/instructor,
- networking, reflection and sharing of experiences,
- visibility/accessibility of supervisor to both the student teachers and the cooperating

teachers,

- convenience of meeting regularly on-site.

Cooperating Teachers

The cooperating teacher acts as a mentor and role model to student teachers. Student teachers indicate that the cooperating teacher plays a critical role in their development as teachers. This notion is reflected by Joyce (1988), who states, "It is generally believed that the most influential feature of the most influential program component [student teaching] is the cooperating teacher" (p. 33). "Since cooperating teachers are often cited as having a significant impact upon preservice teachers in field experiences, it may become necessary to provide courses in supervision for them" (Goodman, 1988, p. 47). At the very least, it would be appropriate for the university to recognize both the importance of their contributions and the impact cooperating teachers have on students. Corcoran and Andrew (1988) also believe, "...the University must treat the cooperating teacher as an important colleague and one who is charged with the primary responsibility for instruction in pedagogy" (p. 18).

Cooperating teacher respondents are apprehensive about their lack of preparation prior to student teaching. They want clarification about the supervisor's expectations of them, and express a desire for increased contact with their supervisors. Cooperating teachers want proper and thorough orientation to Temple University and its programs, as well as regular communication and support from the University and the supervisor.

Several Temple cooperating teachers and supervisors indicate that cooperating teachers are not compensated enough for their participation in the program. They recommend that cooperating teachers receive credit for one full course at the University.

Supervisors

"The task of supervisor as observer is to help the [student teacher] make sense of his or her [teaching] experience within the framework of the total curriculum" (Corcoran & Andrew, 1988, p. 21). Supervisors indicate that they were happy to be in a mentoring role; they like to share their experiences and "show the ropes" to the student teachers. One supervisor comments, "I find that there is a great deal of enjoyment in assisting future teachers. There were many bits of information, techniques, strategies, etc., that I was able to disseminate to students. It was a great experience for me!"

Supervisors, like cooperating teachers, would like an orientation to Temple, its policies, and requirements for student teaching prior to the experience.

Student Teachers

There are several areas of concern regarding student teachers that arose throughout the surveys. For the sake of clarity, they are mentioned below:

Classroom Management: In their commentary, student teachers report feeling inadequate in their classroom management skills. They ask that management and discipline techniques be incorporated into methods classes, or for the creation of a class that is devoted to these aspects of teaching. During the course of this study, both those interviewed (student teachers, cooperating teachers, supervisors, Temple University faculty and administrators) and studies identified (Barbour, 1989; Burnstein, 1989; Doyle, 1985; Galluzzo & Craig, 1990; Murphy, 1992; Page, 1983; Weinstein, 1988 and Zeichner, 1992) agree that teachers need training in classroom management theory and application. Cooperating teachers repeatedly indicate that classroom management is an

area that needs more attention in teacher education programs. Supervisors also note deficiencies in student teachers' classroom management skills and stress the importance of this aspect of teaching.

Communication Skills: While cooperating teacher and supervisor likert scale responses to this item are positive, in their comments concern was expressed about the standards to which student teachers are held in regard to their handwriting, grammar and speech. From their observations of student teachers, they indicate that communication skills need to be addressed and monitored.

Clerical Skills: Student teachers indicate the need for orientation to public school policies, procedures and protocol prior to their student teaching experience. Cooperating teachers also report that student teachers, during their student teaching experience, need to be involved in common, practical teaching activities such as, planning and carrying out assembly programs, record keeping, report card preparation, and other clerical duties.

Teaching Skills: Student teachers feel confident about their teaching skills, but indicate that these skills were best developed and fully realized during their student teaching experience. Cooperating teachers and supervisors agree with this concept. It is generally felt that student teachers benefit by having more opportunities in the field to try out methods and techniques learned during their coursework. This affords students an opportunity where the theory of their coursework and

the reality of the classroom come together. As Weinstein (1989) states, "...experience helps teachers comprehend the complexity of classroom life" (p. 54).

Administration

There are several administrative areas in the student teaching process which need to be addressed by the CITE Department.

A unified scheme that clearly defines the student teaching process, including participant roles, expectations and evaluation procedures is necessary in the preparation and orientation of student teachers, cooperating teachers and supervisors prior to the student teaching experience. There is also a call for establishment of clearer and more direct communication between those involved in the process. All three groups refer to these areas in their commentary.

Cooperating teachers express uncertainty about the role of supervisors and the supervisor's expectations of both cooperating and student teachers. To best help student teachers improve their skills, an open, collaborative environment needs to be established wherein cooperating teachers and supervisors work in conjunction when supervisors evaluate student teachers.

Conclusion

In part, our approach followed Scriven's (1972) goal free evaluation ideal, where the evaluator is not predisposed to look for anticipated outcomes, and is free to seek (blindly), to "discover" any and all information that can be used to discuss the worth and merit of the program. Evaluations are political by nature and bias is inherent in any evaluator or stakeholder. In an attempt to be objective, a non-prejudicial stance was taken. The intent was to seek information about the process and perceptions surrounding the student teaching experience, via the vantage points of those directly involved, i.e., student teachers, cooperating teachers and student teacher supervisors. The information is presented in an informal, non-technical manner so that all may develop a clear,

accurate understanding of the experience, and to provide future evaluators and others who conduct assessment activities a foundation or reference point for further study. It is our recommendation that future evaluators determine beforehand the reasons for program assessment and consider why and how the results will be used to enhance educational policy and/or practice. Furthermore, Galluzzo and Craig suggest (1990):

> It is incumbent upon a program evaluator to communicate regularly with the program faculty in planning the data collection effort....With continued investigation, the sophistication of the questions improves, the methods for collecting data improve, and the likelihood of achieving the four purposes [accountability, improvement, understanding, and knowledge production] increases. As a result of this study, not only do the program faculty know more about their programs, but they also (a) are in better positions to consider changes in their programs, (b) have added to the body of knowledge about program-evaluation methodology, and (c) have addressed the effects of experience on the self report perceptions of [respondents]. (pp. 610-611)

Implementing educational reform is not a simple matter. Goodman (1988) points out that many reforms are initiated from external agencies with a "top down" implementation plan. He states that:

> Research suggests that these efforts are almost always doomed to failure simply because teachers (who are expected to carry out these plans) have little personal investment or sense of ownership over the reform agenda. Teachers often respond to these efforts with passive noncompliance as in the case of the "teacher proof"

> science curricula of the 1950's or the effort to implement "new math" during the 1960's. In some cases, teachers openly resist reform efforts that are simply "handed down" to them for implementation....The lesson to be learned from these "top down" reform efforts is perhaps best stated...in Wolcott (1977, p. xi): "Certainly school people can benefit from outside help, as can people in other types of organizations. But they will benefit only if they receive help in doing what they think needs to be done, in doing what they believe in doing. They need to be partners in a venture, not the victims in that venture. (p. 46)

In a discussion of the problems surrounding bureaucracies and program evaluation, Horst, Nay, Scanlon & Wholey (1974) describe the critical management problem confronting [institutions] and evaluation: "Why have those in charge of programs and those who evaluate them not been able to join their efforts in a way that leads more frequently to significant improvements in program performance?" (p. 300). They identify three problems: 1) lack of definition, 2) lack of clear logic, and 3) lack of management. Lack of definition implies that, "the problem addressed, the program intervention being made, the expected direct outcome of that intervention, or the expected impact on the overall society or on the problem addressed are not sufficiently well defined to be measurable." Lack of clear logic means that "the logic of assumptions linking expenditure of resources, the implementation of a program intervention, the immediate outcome to be caused by that intervention, and the resulting impact are not specified or understood clearly enough to permit testing them." Lack of management suggests that "those in charge of the program lack the motivation, understanding, ability or authority to

act on evaluation measurements and comparisons of actual intervention activity, actual outcomes, and actual impact" (p. 301). A real-world example of such a problem is found in the 1987 Temple NCATE report wherein the intent for continual program evaluation is stated:

> As a further way of insuring continual program evaluation, the College of Education has charged the Associate Dean for Research and Development to develop and implement a systematic and formal means of evaluating programs and graduates on a yearly basis. In summary, not only has the College kept abreast of current methodologies being used, it has incorporated these methods into its own evaluation procedures, and it has committed resources to an advanced research and development program in the hope of improving the evaluation process in the decade to come. (NCATE Report, p. 65)

Effective and efficient program improvement is a team process. The power for constructive change lies within in all parties, administrative and non-administrative. Either side cannot accomplish anything successfully without the other. The literature (Astin, 1993; Galluzzo & Craig, 1990; Goodman,1988; Horst, et al., 1974; Lindsay, 1985; Wolcott, 1977) reflects the need for all participants to work in concert in order to achieve meaningful change. Instructors must remain assured that their professional autonomy will not be undermined, while administrators must realize that their goals will best be met with faculty cooperation. Astin's (1993) narrative on assessment for excellence refers to the:

> ...importance of educating faculty about the possible benefits and the importance of their active participation and cooperation. Certain incentives should probably

> be provided...in order to secure their cooperation....While it may not be necessary or even desirable to involve faculty formally in the development of the preliminary retention data base, it is absolutely necessary that they be involved from the beginning in any attempt at cognitive data collection. The reason is simple: Most college courses deal with cognitive functioning of some sort, and faculty have a vested interest in any assessment activities that bear directly on cognitive functioning. Even though cognitive outcome assessment can provide teaching faculty with important informational feedback, it also represents a potential threat if faculty feel it will be used to evaluate their teaching performance. (p. 169)

In their paper on preservice teacher education evaluation practices, Galluzzo and Craig (1990) find that recent writings (e.g., Freeman, 1987) about program evaluation in teacher education emphasize the utilization of results as an essential attribute of a complete program evaluation effort. They state:

> A major weakness of virtually all of the teacher education program evaluation models we found is that knowledge utilization is not considered an essential ingredient. An evaluation in which useful and usable data are collected and that meets the criterion of internal logic is doomed to failure unless knowledge utilization is considered at every evaluation decision point. (p. 613)

In other words, when developing an evaluative procedure, consideration should be given to how the information gathered during that process will be used. Before

addressing the issue of how to evaluate, it is necessary to look at why the evaluation is being done. Once the reason for evaluation is determined, it becomes possible to develop a means of gathering information congruent to the evaluative objectives.

Until actions are taken to refine the teacher education process based upon the findings of this study, further surveys of student teachers are unnecessary and redundant. It is valid to evaluate other components of the teacher education process, but future program evaluation efforts should focus on refining the process of program assessment, taking into consideration the stakeholders' perspectives, the rationale for and the implementation of assessment, and the consequences of actions taken as a result of the assessment findings.

References

Astin, A.W. (1990). Assessment for excellence: The philosophy and practice of assessment and evaluation in higher education. Phoenix, AZ: Oryx Press.

Barbour, C. (1989, March). Preservice teacher development: Studying a personal landscape. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA.

Burnstein, N.D. (1989, March). The transition and supervision of student teachers in elementary schools: A comparative analysis of two assignments. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA.

Corcoran, E. & Andrew., M. (1988, May-June). A full year internship: An example of school-university collaboration. Journal of Teacher Education, pp. 17 - 22.

Doyle, W. (1985, May-June). Recent research on classroom management: Implications for teacher preparation. Journal of Teacher Education, pp. 31 - 35.

Freeman, D.J., (1987, October). Issues and strategies for using program evaluation findings in teacher education at Michigan State University. Paper presented at the American Evaluation Association, Boston.

Galluzzo, G.R. & Craig, J.R. (1990). Evaluation of preservice teacher education programs. In W.R. Huston (Ed.), Handbook of Research on Teacher Education (pp. 599 - 616). New York: Macmillan.

Goodlad, J. (1990). Teachers for our nation's schools. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Goodman, J. (1988, September-October). University culture and the problem of reforming field experiences in teacher education. Journal of Teacher Education, pp. 45 - 53.

Horst, P., Nay, J.N., Scanlon, J.W., & Wholey, J.S. (1974). Program management and the federal evaluator. Public Administration Review, 34, 300 - 308.

Joyce, B.R. (1988, September-October). Training research and preservice teacher education: A reconsideration. Journal of Teacher Education, pp. 32 - 36.

Lindsay, M. (1985, March-April). Procedures for follow up studies of teacher education graduates. Journal of Teacher Education, pp. 29 - 33.

Moore, K.D. (1988). A model for teacher preparation. Contemporary Education, 59 (2),104 - 109.

Murphy, P. D. (1992, February). Follow up studies in program evaluation. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, San Antonio, TX.

National Center for Research on Teacher Education. (1988, November-December). Teacher education and learning to teach: A research agenda. Journal for Teacher Education, pp. 27 - 32.

National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education. (1992). Standards, procedures, and policies for the accreditation of professional education units. Washington, D.C.: Author.

Page, J., et al. (1983, April). Teacher education curricula: Perceptions of first-year teachers. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Montreal, Canada.

Scriven, M. (1972). Prose and cons of goal-free evaluation. Evaluation Comment, 3(4), 1.

Temple University - Of The Commonwealth System of Higher Education. (1987, March). Institutional Overview: Institutional report for review by the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), 1 (Available from Temple University, Philadelphia, PA 19122)

Turney, C., Eltiskik, Tower, J., & Wright, R. (1985). A new basis for teacher education: The practicum curriculum. Sydney, Australia: Sydney University Press.

Waller, W. (1932). The sociology of teaching. New York: Wiley.

Weinstein, C.S. (1989, March-April). Teacher education students' preconceptions of teaching. Journal of Teacher Education, pp. 53 - 60.

Wolcott, H. (1977). Teacher versus technocrats: An educational innovation in anthropological perspective. Eugene, OR: Center for Educational Policy and Management.

Zeichner, K. (1980). Myths and realities: Field based experiences in preservice teacher education. Journal of Teacher Education, 31(6), 45 - 55

Zeichner, K. (1992, September-October). Rethinking the practicum in the professional development school partnership. Journal of Teacher Education, pp. 296 - 307.